

SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS: Officer designations should be used in the "TO" column. Under each comment a line should be drawn across sheet and each comment numbered to correspond with the number in the "TO" column. Each officer should initial (check mark insufficient) before further routing. This Routing and Record Sheet should be returned to Registry.

FROM:

[]

NO.

31 Jan 54

DATE

1 Feb 53

TO	ROOM NO.	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS
		REC'D	FWD'D		
1. King		FEB 2	1954	[]	<p>SIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM RELEASE AS SANITIZED</p> <p>2003</p> <p>File in new file to be set up entitled: "Overt reports"</p>
2.				[]	
[]				[]	
[]					
6.					
7.					
8.					
9.					
10.					
11.					
12.					
13.					
14.					
15.					

31 January 1954

MEMORANDUM TO: Col. J. C. King
Atten: Jake Esterline

FROM: C J

SUBJECT: Transmitting copy of Congressional Record

1. Senator Wiley's speech on Guatemala appears on pp. 230-232 of the attached copy of Congressional Record.

2. After ordering two copies in accordance with your request, we received a request from Chief, RQM/CIS for a copy which he wishes to see tomorrow morning. We therefore are holding the second copy for him, which we will send over to you after he has seen it.

**CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM
RELEASE AS SANITIZED**

2003

currencies of foreign countries, which currencies we could use in a multitude of ways. In the wisdom of those on that committee, charged with the responsibility it was thought that such a provision would not be germane by way of an amendment, but should be introduced as a separate measure.

The Senator from Kansas introduced a separate measure. It was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am sure that the Senator from Louisiana, in following these matters, because his State is a most important agricultural State and has great capacity to produce agricultural commodities, will recall that that measure passed the Senate. The measure authorized \$500 million worth of our agricultural surpluses to be used in foreign trade by the various governmental departments. The difficulty has been that the foreign nations did not have the American dollars with which to buy the products. This measure bridged that gap.

I intend to have placed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the opening statement which the Senator from Kansas made at the time when the measure to which reference has been made was introduced. It was passed by the Senate, and now rests in the House of Representatives, which will consider it if and when it gets to it. However, I think legislation is needed which will go as far as possible to take care of the situation about which the Senator from Louisiana may have some misgivings. We want to get rid of our agricultural surpluses, since the taxpayers' dollars are tied up in them, in a manner which will enable the American people to receive value for the surplus products, and at the same time relieve our domestic economy of a serious burden.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield further?

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. It seems to me that the Senator from Kansas has made a very fine suggestion, provided there are sufficient safeguards to assure the people of the United States that there will be a careful accounting, and that an opportunity will be given to Members of Congress, and all others who may desire to inquire into the matter, to know precisely what is being done with the surplus products. The only thing some of us fear is that perhaps some of the commodities might be disposed of loosely. Some of us would want adequate information in order to protect the public interest, and see to it that our people received for the commodities their money's worth.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. The remarks of the Senator from Louisiana are appropriate; such an opportunity should be afforded. The activity should be further safeguarded to the extent that full and adequate information and reports should be made. I believe a provision was placed in the measure passed which required reports to the Congress from the proper departments of Government who are handling these matters, which I think is an excellent provision.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator from Kansas again yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, there is an advantage in the sale of these surplus commodities, the receipt of which pay for overseas bases, instead of paying for them in dollars. In many instances people overseas tend to hoard American dollars and to get the very best currency they can. There is an old axiom in banking and currency that bad money drives good money out of circulation. When a person has good money he has a tendency to peddle off the money that is not good, which loses its value, and hoard over a long period the money which he knows will be more valuable, and the use of the surpluses in the manner suggested would prevent hoarding of money paid for defense overseas.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I appreciate the contribution made by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. To what extent are the food surpluses used by the Armed Forces?

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. In the amendment that was placed in the Mutual Defense Act, as I recall, surpluses could be utilized to the extent of \$200 million.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Will the Senator state, if he knows, the reason for that limitation?

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I would have much preferred to have the amount made larger, more in line with what the Senator from Kansas had advocated in the measure he introduced. But it was thought that the sum of \$200 million would provide a basis for a trial on the part of, let us say, the Mutual Defense Agency, in connection with the State Department and the Department of Defense, to see to what extent the surpluses could be utilized.

Quite frankly, Mr. President, I have not requested detailed information on this matter from those departments, but I expect to do so.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I think it would be very interesting to see what the figures show.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, surpluses, like burst appendixes, have to be removed. We have to get surpluses out of the market, if we are to restore its health.

Surpluses sold to the CCC have not been marketed; they have only been swept under the rug, so to speak, and stored. They have not been cleaned out of or away from the market. The CCC is not a market. It is only a market stabilizer. Its operations make gradual adjustments possible. Farm products have not been marketed until they have been eaten, fed, or worn and paid for. The place for agricultural surpluses is either in the stomachs or on the backs of people who need them. Many such people are in foreign countries in which we wish to market our products, and

these people need them. They have the capacity to pay, if we will buy and make intelligent use of what they can offer.

I have had a very deep concern over the prospect of mounting surpluses of farm products. Last year I appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in support of an amendment which would have had surplus farm products used to reinforce our national security program. It was the consensus of that committee that my proposal was not germane to Mutual Security legislation then pending. I then introduced a bill, S. 2127, which was considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The bill was amended slightly in committee and was passed unanimously by the Senate as Senate bill 2475.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTER in the chair). The Chair reminds the Senator from Kansas that under the unanimous-consent agreement he was allotted 10 minutes, which now have expired.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Kansas may proceed.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a statement made by me on July 28, 1953, as it appears on page 10427 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES TO IMPROVE THE FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, as will be observed from the report which accompanies the pending bill, it follows to a limited extent, sections of other measures which have heretofore been before the Senate. The pending bill is a bill to authorize the President to use agricultural commodities to improve the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, having considered the bill, as it is specifically stated in the report, reports the bill and recommends that it do pass without amendment. Senators who serve on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and other Senators also, I am sure know that the Senate had before it during this session a number of bills authorizing the barter or sale for foreign currencies, of surplus agricultural commodities.

Farm organizations, various Senators and others have evidenced considerable interest in these proposals; and section 550 was added to the Mutual Security Act of 1951 at this session to provide for such sale. While the Department of Agriculture, as set out in exhibit A of this report, believes that section 550 is sufficient at this time, your committee feels that the additional authority provided by the bill is necessary if we are to make an adequate attempt to discover whether sale for foreign currencies presents a profitable avenue for disposing of surplus agricultural commodities and for expanding world trade.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has in prospect by the end of this year an investment in stocks owned or under purchase

agreement of approximately \$5 billion. S. 2475 is the only proposal brought before this body this session that comes to grips in a realistic way with this very urgent problem.

In dealing with surplus agricultural products we have 1 or 2 alternatives—either shrink the agricultural plant of this country to existing markets, which we have learned in the last few weeks is a most unsatisfactory approach politically and is dangerous economically. The other alternative is to seek to develop means to increase exports and reinforce the mutual-security program to protect our existing markets and create new ones. S. 2475 with an authorization of \$500 million would achieve these objectives. It is a matter of utmost urgency that this legislation be enacted before adjournment in order to start work on the disposal of surpluses immediately.

The recently enacted Mutual Security Act of 1953 contained a provision to authorize the President to enter into agreements with friendly countries for the sale and export of surplus agricultural commodities and accept for them local currency for the account of the United States. It provides that in the negotiation of the agreements, the President would take special precaution to safeguard the existing markets.

The section further provides that the local currencies received by the United States for agricultural products sold are to be used (a) for providing military assistance, such as to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and for Indochina; (b) for the purchase of goods or services needed in other friendly countries; (c) for loans for increasing production, including strategic materials; (d) for developing new markets for agricultural products; (e) for grants-in-aid to increase production; and (f) for stockpiling materials needed by the United States.

Section 550 of the Mutual Security Act sets the framework within which agricultural markets can be expanded. S. 2475, authorizing \$500 million, will give sufficient money to give this new concept of expanding agricultural markets a full test.

Senate bill 2475, in addition to providing the half billion dollars to effectuate section 550, establishes a procedure which will assure that the majority of the sales will be made through private traders rather than on a State trading basis.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF SENATE BILL 2475, AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1953

Section 2 declares that the policy of the Congress is to use excess agricultural commodities to expand the free world economies by promoting additional trade and strengthening the economies of cooperating nations.

Section 3 authorizes the President, in accordance with the provisions of section 550 of the Mutual Security Act, to (a) make excess commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation available for sale and (b) direct the Commodity Credit Corporation, in accordance with adequate safeguards to convert into dollars the currency received by exporters for selling agricultural products provided that the total value of the CCC stocks and the dollars used for conversion of local currency do not exceed \$500 million.

Under domestic operations of CCC, on receipt of documents that wheat has been inspected and sealed, CCC pays. Under this provision, upon receipt of documents that foreign currency has been deposited to the account of the United States, pursuant to all the conditions prescribed by the President, CCC would pay.

Section 4 defines excess agricultural commodities as those determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of probable domestic and export sales plus a reserve for working stocks.

Section 5 directs the President to administer the provisions of the act so as to export the maximum quantities of agricultural commodities with the funds made available to him for that purpose. This is to avoid the use of the funds for unwarranted processing and other expenses that could be borne by receiving countries.

Section 6 is a congressional authorization for appropriation to the CCC to reimburse it for commodities transferred pursuant to the act and for funds used in the conversion of local currencies. It authorizes any funds or assets available to the CCC to be used in advance of appropriations, for carrying out the purposes of the act.

It also requires that the Mutual Security Administration reimburse the CCC in dollars for local currencies used for, first, providing military assistance; second, for loans to increase production of goods or services including strategic materials; or third, for grants-in-aid to increase production.

Section 7 states that no programs shall be undertaken under this authority after June 30, 1955.

Section 8 directs the President to report to the Congress with respect to the activities carried on under this act at least once each 6 months and at such other times as may be appropriate.

That section was added, I may say, so that Congress could keep informed as to whether the proposed use of the agricultural surpluses would appropriately serve the interests of the United States.

Mr. President, with that explanation, may I say that there were a number of proposals by way of bills before the Senate and the House of Representatives in an effort to do what is provided by this measure.

I say very frankly to my colleagues that I have no pride of authorship in the bill. I am explaining it because I am a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, together with other Senators who have joined in sponsoring the bill.

We seek to provide an opportunity and an avenue for the use of agricultural commodities we have in surplus supply, by sending them to countries of the world that are friendly to us, and whose people are friendly to us. It is proposed that that be done under proper safeguards, as we view them, and under arrangements to accept in payment the currencies of those countries, and use them in the way outlined in the bill. This is a bill to promote trade. In no sense does the bill provide for a giveaway program.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture stated that no additional legislation for the export of farm surpluses was needed at that time. The House Agriculture Committee did not act on the bill before adjournment. We now have in prospect a CCC investment of \$6.5 billion in farm surpluses overhanging the market. This distinguished body has a responsibility to its constituents—the American public—to use these surpluses constructively.

The news that consideration is being given to use surplus foods to pay for bases is the first indication that the administration is coming to grips with this problem. Yet there is abundant evidence that large quantities of farm surpluses can be sold abroad for local currencies.

These currencies can be used to increase the capacity of our customers to buy more farm products, and thus enable the highest possible level of farm production with the minimum of Government control. They can be used to reinforce our national security, to purchase

stockpiles of strategic materials, and for other constructive purposes which further our national interest. Our farm surpluses represent a capital investment of the people of the United States. We are obliged to assure that that capital is managed well in the public interest.

That interest will be served well, in my opinion, if the surpluses are used as a capital revolving fund of many currencies to build a powerful and sound economic alliance of free nations to reinforce our \$50 billion a year military Goliaths who stand in an economic quagmire.

The surpluses must not be given away; they must not be allowed to spoil. They must not be swept under the rug. They are needed in the world. They can be sold. They must be sold, and the proceeds must be used prudently. I hope the news item to which I have referred indicates a decision by the administration to do just that.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to state that my senior colleague from Kansas is a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and we in Kansas are very happy that he is a member of that committee. Not only our State but the Nation is fortunate in having the benefit of his services.

I appreciate very much the extremely fine statement he has made in behalf of agriculture. He continually works in the interests of the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I thank my colleague.

COMMUNISM IN GUATEMALA—A MENACE TO HEMISPHERIC SECURITY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to take the time of the Senate for a few moments to comment on a problem which has long concerned me in the field of foreign relations.

I refer to the problem of communism in Guatemala.

As a matter of fact, the actions of the present leaders of the Government of Guatemala have been cause for deepest concern to this country and to other nations of the hemisphere and the free world.

SMOKESCREENS SHOULD NOT DIVERT US

Guatemala's present leaders have tried to throw up numerous smokescreens. They have tried to portray the United States' concern as being solely over the issue of unfair treatment which Guatemala has inflicted on American enterprise doing business there, particularly mal-treatment of the United Fruit Co.

Now, it is a fact that the United States is concerned about such unfair treatment. The United States will of course continue to protect the rights of its citizens abroad. It will continue to protect the rights of American stockholders and bondholders and management, as would any other sovereign

country seek to protect the rights of its nationals.

But this is not the basic issue. This is not the source of our deepest concern, as regards Guatemala.

THE ALARMING COMMUNIST BEACHHEAD

The source of our concern is that Guatemala has become a serious beachhead for international communism in this hemisphere.

No smokescreen should divert any other people or ourselves from that alarming fact.

The Guatemalan leaders must not be permitted to distort this issue and pretend as if the people of the United States were against internal reform measures in foreign lands.

On the contrary, we are the first to wish the Guatemalan people well in improving their standard of living. My country has demonstrated conclusively for over 10 years, through technical assistance programs, our deep interest in Guatemala achieving more of the good things of life for its people—in city and country—better food, better housing, better health. The inspiring record of the United States stands for all to see in our contributions to similar goals throughout the world.

NO SUCH THING AS "NATIVE" COMMUNISM

But I repeat: What concerns us in Guatemala is international communism. Make no mistake: There is no communism but the communism which takes orders from the despots of the Kremlin in Moscow.

It is an absolute myth to believe that there is such a thing as homegrown communism, a so-called native or local communism. There is no such thing.

Communism does not tolerate dissidents within its ranks anywhere in the world. There is every evidence to prove that there has been no dissent by Guatemalan Communists from the revolutionary party line laid down in Moscow.

INTERLOCKING KREMLIN AND GUATEMALAN COMMUNISM

But now I want to prove by a series of clear facts the interlocking interrelationship between Guatemalan communism and Moscow communism.

I shall cite some 22 facts—in question and answer form. This list could be expanded to 220 facts, because every day the alarming evidences multiply.

Here, however, for everyone to see, are a few of the elements of the stark record of the subservience by Guatemalan communism to Moscow communism.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON RED INFLUENCE—DO COMMUNISTS HAVE IMPORTANT POSITIONS IN THE GUATEMALAN GOVERNMENT?

First. They occupy key spots in radio, press, agrarian administration and the social-security system.

The Director General of Radio Broadcasting and director of the Government radio station, TGW, Carlos Alvarado Jerez, is a Communist.

Second. The Chief of the Press Section of President Arbenz publicity office, Raul Leiva, is a Communist.

Third. In the National Agrarian Department, which administers the Guatemalan agrarian reform law, the No. 2

official, Waldemar Barrios Klee, Chief of the Lands Department, is a member of the Guatemalan Communist Party.

The chief clerk of the department is Maria Jerez de Fortuny, wife of the head of the Communist Party.

Over 15 other Agrarian Department officials are publicly avowed members of the Communist Party, including at least 4 agrarian inspectors.

Fourth. The Director of the official Guatemalan Government Social Security Agency, Alfonso Solorzano, is a Communist.

Fifth. The Deputy Inspector General of Labor, Hugo Barrios Klee, is a member of the Guatemalan Communist Party.

ARE GUATEMALAN COMMUNISTS PART OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT?

Sixth. The leaders of the Guatemalan Communist Party, including Jose Manuel Fortuny, Victor Manuel Gutierrez, Carlos Manuel Pellecer, Mario Silva Jonama, Jose Alberto Cardoza, have visited Moscow, some of them frequently. Fortuny, head of the party, last went to Moscow in November 1953 and has just returned after 2 months of usual training and instruction.

Seventh. Victor Manuel Gutierrez, a leading Communist Party member and labor boss of Guatemala, after returning in January 1952 from a visit to Moscow immediately disbanded a separate Communist Party he was then leading in favor of the organization still headed by Fortuny.

Eighth. In a message to the Soviet Nineteenth Party Congress held in Moscow in October 1952, the Guatemalan Communist Party saluted the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as its inspiration and as a beacon for the workers of the world.

Ninth. The central Cominform organization, through an article published in its worldwide newspaper "for a lasting peace for a people's democracy" on January 16, 1953, openly adopted the Guatemalan Communist Party under its new name Guatemalan Labor Party.

Tenth. The Cominform journal cited above on December 11, 1953, eulogized the Guatemalan Communist daily newspaper Tribuna Popular.

Eleventh. Writings of Jose Manuel Fortuny, head of the Guatemalan Communist Party, are published in the Cominform newspaper For a Lasting Peace and in the New York Daily Worker.

Twelfth. Pravda on December 14, 1953, published an article openly praising the Guatemalan Government.

HAS THE GUATEMALAN GOVERNMENT ENCOURAGED COMMUNISM IN GUATEMALA?

Thirteenth. The Guatemalan Government furnished a theater to the Guatemalan Communist Party for its first public rally, held on June 21, 1951, and attended by the Minister of Education and other important Government officials.

At this meeting Jose Manuel Fortuny, secretary general of the Guatemalan Communist Party, announced his party would seek official recognition in order to participate in future political elections under its own name.

Fourteenth. On December 19, 1952, the Government officially registered the Guatemalan Communist Party, thus granting it full recognition under the electoral laws in disregard of a constitutional prohibition against "political organizations of a foreign or international character." Five days before being inscribed, the Guatemalan Communist Party changed its name to Guatemalan Labor Party.

Fifteenth. The Government political parties controlled by President Arbenz openly supported the Communist leaders, Jose Manuel Fortuny and Carlos Manuel Pellecer, in the January 1953 congressional elections.

Sixteenth. On May 1, 1953, President Arbenz publicly embraced Victor Manuel Gutierrez and Carlos Manuel Pellecer, Communist leaders who control Guatemala's General Labor Confederation.

Seventeenth. Government agencies advertise in the Communist daily newspaper Tribuna Popular, providing practically its only visible means of financial support.

Eighteenth. The Government's official radio and newspaper have disseminated pro-Communist, anti-United States propaganda for years.

Nineteenth. Communist propaganda films accusing the United States of engaging in "bacteriological warfare" have been exhibited in Government buildings.

Twentieth. The Government publicly donated \$10,000 to the Second Continental Conference of the Communist-run International Association of Democratic Lawyers, held in the Guatemalan Supreme Court Building last October. The Minister of Interior and the Chief Justice of Guatemala welcomed the delegates to the conference.

Twenty-first. Sra. Maria Vilanova de Arbenz, wife of the President of Guatemala, is a founding member of the Guatemalan Communist-front women's organization, Guatemalan Feminine Alliance—Alianza Femenina Guatemalteca.

Twenty-second. Several high government officials and the heads of all four pro-Arbenz political parties participated in an event staged in a government school building by the Communist-front National Peace Committee on July 31, 1953, to celebrate the Communist victory over American imperialism in Korea.

CONCERN OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS SUBCOMMITTEE

In the light of these and other facts, the developments in Guatemala will continue to be watched with closest attention, not only by myself, but by my colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and elsewhere in the Congress.

In particular, our American Republics Subcommittee, whose expert chairman is the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], will be watching developments very closely, in consultation with the distinguished Assistant Secretary of State for Latin-American Affairs, the Honorable John M. Cabot.

When our able Ambassador to Guatemala, John Puerifoy visits Washington,

(over)

I expect to discuss with him the problem in greatest detail.

For many years I have been in close contact with the State Department on this problem.

I have supplemented my information by first hand reports from those of my colleagues who have visited Guatemala and from the report of a staff member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee itself whom I assigned specifically on this issue.

I wish to reemphasize now that it is not just the United States alone which views the developments in Guatemala with deepest apprehension. It is the hemisphere as a whole and the free world as a whole.

We in the United States, however, have been particularly singled out by the Guatemalan Communists for attack.

POISON SPREAD AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The bitterest form of hostility has been demonstrated by the Guatemalan Communists in their speeches, in their press writings toward us.

I have in my hand an illustration of the type of evil poster which the Guatemalan Communists have published in trying to defame and smear the United States. This poster or cartoon was published by the misnamed Guatemalan Labor Party—that is, the Guatemalan Communists. It has been spread all over Guatemala. It shows the effort which is being made to arouse the sentiment of the common peon or peasant against Uncle Sam. It is an indication of what the Kremlin is doing at our own back door. It purports to show Uncle Sam reaching out his rifle and bayonet—wielding hands to control Guatemala. This is a lie which is even lower than the usual level of Red falsehood.

The United States does not seek to exercise dominion over any people. The United States believes in a policy of non-intervention and noninterference. We believe in the equality of sovereign states, large and small. We believe in good neighborliness and cooperation among all nations. We believe in the right of peoples to work out their own destiny in their own way, provided of course they do not harm the rights of others.

I conclude, Mr. President, with the earnest hope and prayer that the Guatemalan situation will not deteriorate further, thus endangering not only the well-being of the Guatemalan people themselves, but the security of the Western Hemisphere as a whole.

Mr. President, let us not forget that this is not in Europe. This is not over in Korea. This is right at our own back door. The situation in Guatemala is truly challenging. For that reason I felt that it was my duty, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, to bring this subject to the attention of the Senate.

AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD THE GOVERNMENT OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, the question of American policy with respect to the government of Communist China, and, indeed, American policy toward Asia

in general, continues to be a subject of the most vital concern to our people. And well it should be.

We have fought a bloody war in Korea at tremendous sacrifice, a war which is today mercifully suspended, but a war in which we and our allies nevertheless failed to attain our final objectives.

These objectives, in case anybody has forgotten them today, were the defeat of unprovoked aggression and the unification of the Nation of Korea.

Each of these objectives have been thwarted by the military and political policies of the Communist Government of China, which the United States and its allies today face in a prolonged stalemate.

Viewed realistically, there is little satisfaction to be gained from this situation, for the simple reason that we are dealing with one of the most brutal and savage regimes yet to appear on this earth, a government totally lacking in principle of any kind, and absolutely devoid of honor.

Nothing—not one single act or deed—can be pointed to which would afford the least indication that the government of Red China will alter its course of hatred for the United States and the free world. Instead there is all too evident proof that the slightest show of weakness or concession on our part will only encourage the Chinese Reds to be all the more extreme and demanding in their attitude.

This leads me to the specific subject which I have in mind today.

Within recent days statements attributed to Mr. Arthur H. Dean, our Special Ambassador to Korea and our chief delegate in the Panmunjom conferences with the Chinese and North Korean Communists, have appeared in the press. Because of Mr. Dean's official position, his views, as I have read them, are obviously important and would tend to commit this Government to policies which do not have the support of the Majority Leader, the distinguished senior Senator from California (Mr. KNOWLAND); of Walter Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs; of Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; or of Representative WALTER Judd, of Minnesota. I do not know where these views originate, but I do know that similar views are presently being advocated by certain left-wing columnists in the daily press.

I regret to say that Mr. Dean, according to an interview published on January 3, 1954, in the Providence Journal, calls for a review of the policy of the United States with regard to the government of Communist China and the government of Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa.

Mr. Dean offers the view which has long been held by pro-Red China apologists in the State Department that—

There is a possibility that the Chinese Communists are more interested in developing themselves in China than they are in international communism.

I cannot believe anything can be farther from the truth.

Mr. Dean raises the possibility of "putting a wedge between the Chinese Communists and the Soviet Union." He does this despite the fact that the leaders of Communist China have, by their state-

ments and their military actions, proved themselves to be complete tools of the international Communist conspiracy and its plan for world conquest.

Left-wing columnists are today calling for more realism in our attitude toward Communist China. In a similar vein, Mr. Dean now demands that we remove our rosy glasses and try another pair in our own tough, realistic self-interest.

I am curious as to what the possible long-range implications of his proposal might be in connection with our announced policy toward Red China.

I ask this question because, setting aside the elaborate and flowery language used by Mr. Dean, it is crystal clear that what he is talking about is nothing less than a need for reversing the existing American policy toward Asia and embarking upon a totally different course of action.

Mr. President, my further question is: By what authority does Mr. Dean take it upon himself to discuss any such proposition at this time? I should like to ask if he is speaking with the blessing of the Secretary of State or the President of the United States. Certainly Mr. Dean was never confirmed as Ambassador by the Senate of the United States and cannot lay claim to its approval. I should appreciate being corrected if I am wrong, but it has been my understanding that our present policy has the support of this Nation, and I am unaware of any determined insistence by the American people that it be changed.

Mr. Dean and others contend that we should look at Asia with more realism. What I want to know is, What is so unrealistic about the administration's present policy? To me, and I am certain, speak for the bulk of the people of the State of Idaho, the refusal of a policy to offer the slightest concessions to the Red Chinese is the absolute height of realism.

It is a real policy because it refuses to offer a bribe to the slave rulers of China. It is a realistic policy because it refuses even to discuss the possibility of United Nations membership for a blood-thirsty aggressor whose policies have brought murderous ruin and destruction to millions. It is a realistic policy because it recognizes the sacrifices in blood which American soldiers have paid on the hills of Korea.

But today individuals such as Mr. Dean are beginning to question the wisdom of this policy, and in a round-about manner are chanting the siren song of collaboration with the rulers of Red China.

Chiang Kai-shek, the legal President of China, is tossed aside as ineffective and unreliable. We are asked by Mr. Dean to take a hard, critical stare at the military potentialities, the intentions, being to point to the President of the China as the leader of a lost cause.

Here, as elsewhere in Mr. Dean's remarks, the clearly suggested alternative is to turn hopefully to the Chinese Reds—the same Reds who have turned the once great nation of China into a land of terror and death; the same Reds who have proclaimed their love for peoples democracy, while exterminating it from the very earth.